**STAFF USE ONLY**

**PROJECT NUMBER:** *03-249*
**CASES:** *TR 060259*
*CUP*

# * * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * *

## COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
## DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

**I.A. Map Date:** *08/20/03* **Staff Member:** ***Roxanne Tanemori***

**Thomas Guide:** *4462 G 3-5, H-3-5, J-3-4* **USGS Quad:** *Mint Canyon*

**Location:** ***Northeast extension of Shadow Pines Blvd., east of Snow Drop Court and Jasmine Valley Drive, Canyon Country***

**Description of Project:** *The proposed project is a request for a Tentative Tract Map, a Hillside Management Conditional Use Permit, a Grading Project Conditional Use Permit, and a Density Controlled Development Conditional Use Permit to create a five-hundred seventeen (517) lot residential development on Four (4) existing parcels totaling 500.6 acres. The proposed developments consists of four-hundred ninety-two (492) single-family residential lots (each 5,000 to 7,000 square feet); one (1) water tank lot (1.6 acres); one (1) park lot (34 acres), eight (8) open space lots (±288 acres); and fifteen (15) graded slope lots (±55 acres). Necessary grading is anticipated to be approximately five million (5,000,000) cubic yards of cut to be redeposited on site; limited off-site grading is planned immediately north of the subject property. A system of interior curvilinear streets will serve the residences, including roadway extensions of Shadow Pines Boulevard and Snow Drop Court. Public water and sewer infrastructure serving the surrounding residential areas will be extended to provide service to the 492 unit development. Portions of Tick Canyon Creek running through the subject property will be channelized.*

**Gross Acres:** *± 500.6 acres*

**Environmental Setting:** *The proposed project site is located in the unincorporated portion of Canyon Country in the Santa Clarita Valley and is bounded by the City of Santa Clarita to the south and west, Sierra Highway and Davenport Road to the north, and the Antelope Valley Freeway (14) to the south and east. The City of Santa Clarita (community of Canyon Country) is located to the southwest of the site and several proposed residential developments are being planned to the southeast of the site. Vacant, undeveloped land lies to the north, south and east of the site. The project area is undeveloped and has variable slopes and hillside gradients. Dense native vegetation covers the site and a broad seasonal drainage course with numerous lateral tributaries bisects the subject property.*

**Zoning:** *A-1-1 (Light Agriculture, one acre minimum lot size)*

**General Plan:** *R: Non-Urban*

**Community/Area wide Plan:** *U-1 (1.1 to 3.3 du/acre); HM (Hillside Management); Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan*

**Major projects in area:**

| PROJECT NUMBER | DESCRIPTION & STATUS |
|---|---|
| *90-115/96-044 TR 48086* | *592 residential units on 586 acres; Approved by RPC; Pending BOS Appeal* |
| *97-009/TR 36943* | *197 residential units, 1 park lot on 225 acres; Approved 12/09/1998* |
| *89-555* | *Surface Mining Permit on 76 acres; Inactive since February 1990* |
| *89-156/TR 47574* | *7 single family lots; Approved 07/02/2002* |
| *90-002/47573* | *174 residential lots; Inactive since October 1996* |
| *86-258/TR 44344* | *68 single family lots, 1 park/open space lot on 43 acres; Approved 04/28/1988* |

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

## REVIEWING AGENCIES

### Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☒ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ *Caltrans*
- ☒ *US Bureau of Land Mngmt.*
- ☒ *South Coast Air Quality Management District*
- ☐

### Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ *City of Santa Clarita*
- ☒ *William S. Hart High School District*
- ☒ *Sulphur Springs Union School District*
- ☒ *CSU Fullerton, SCCIC*

### Regional Significance

- ☐ None
- ☒ SCAG Criteria
- ☒ Air Quality
- ☒ Water Resources
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

### Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ *US Fish & Wildlife Service*
- ☒ State Fish and Game
- ☒ State Parks
- ☒
- ☐

- ☒ *Newhall County Water District*
- ☒ *SCOPE*
- ☒ *Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society*
- ☒ *Southern California Association of Governments*
- ☒ *Southern California Edison*
- ☒ *Castaic Lake Water Agency*
- ☒ *Agua Dulce Town Council*

### County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Watershed Mgmt. Div.; Traffic & Lighting Division; Geotechnical & Mat. Engineering Division; Land Development Division; Environmental Programs Division; Waterworks/Sewer Main. Division*
- ☒ Health Services: *Environmental Hygiene Program*
- ☒ *Fire Department*
- ☒ *Public Library*
- ☒ *Sheriff Department*
- ☒ *Parks & Recreation*
- ☒ *Sanitation Districts*

| **IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX** | | **ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Less than Significant Impact/No Impact** | | | |
| | | | | **Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation** | | |
| | | | | | | **Potentially Significant Impact** |
| **CATEGORY** | **FACTOR** | Pg | | | | Potential Concern |
| HAZARDS | 1. Geotechnical | 5 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Liquefaction; Earthquake Induced Landslides; Hillside area; 5 million cubic yards of grading* |
| | 2. Flood | 6 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Tick Canyon Creek* |
| | 3. Fire | 7 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Fire Zone 4; access* |
| | 4. Noise | 8 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Construction & operational noise* |
| RESOURCES | 1. Water Quality | 9 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *NPDES compliance; runoff; drainage course* |
| | 2. Air Quality | 10 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Short-term construction & long-term operational emissions; 5 million c.y. grading* |
| | 3. Biota | 11 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Undeveloped hillside; Removal of and impact to significant habitat and native species* |
| | 4. Cultural Resources | 12 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Undeveloped land; oak trees & drainage course* |
| | 5. Mineral Resources | 13 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 6. Agriculture Resources | 14 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 7. Visual Qualities | 15 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Undeveloped hillsides* |
| SERVICES | 1. Traffic/Access | 16 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Increased daily vehicle trips; road construction* |
| | 2. Sewage Disposal | 17 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Expansion of public sewer trunk line necessary* |
| | 3. Education | 18 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Increase in local student population; limited student capacity at local districts* |
| | 4. Fire/Sheriff | 19 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Fire protection and public safety services* |
| | 5. Utilities | 20 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Provision of water; sewer system expansion; fire protection & public safety services; solid waste* |
| OTHER | 1. General | 21 | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ | *Growth inducing impacts* |
| | 2. Environmental Safety | 22 | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | 3. Land Use | 23 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | *CUP for Density Controlled Development and Hillside Management* |
| | 4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec. | 24 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled* |
| | 5. Mandatory Findings | 25 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | *Geotechnical, flood, fire, water quality, air quality, noise, biota, traffic/access, sewage disposal, education, public safety protection, utilities, growth inducement, cultural resources, visual* |

**DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)**

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *7: Non-Urban Hillside*

2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?

3. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

**If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.**

☒ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: *September 18, 2003*

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached) EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

**Environmental Finding:**

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant".

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: *Roxanne Tanemori* Date: *September 18, 2003*

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

## HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?<br>*Approximately ½ mile from Tick Canyon Fault (LA County Safety Element: Fault RuptureHazards and Historic Seismicity); Liquefaction area (LA County Safety Element: Liquefaction Susceptibly); Liquefaction Zone & Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle)* |
| b. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?<br>*Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle)* |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?<br>*Hillside Management area; variable slopes on site* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?<br>*Liquefaction area (LA County Safety Element: Liquefaction Susceptibly); Liquefaction Zone & Earthquake-Induced Landslides Zone (State of California Seismic Hazards Zones map, Mint Canyon Quadrangle)* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?<br>*492 single-family residences are proposed.* |
| f. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?<br>*Approximately 5,000,000 cubic yards are proposed for grading* |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |
| h. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No Impact

## HAZARDS - 2. Flood

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?<br>*Tick Canyon Creek runs through the project site.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?<br>*Tick Canyon Creek runs through the project site.* |
| e. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?<br>*Portions of Tick Canyon Creek will be channelized; Drainage pattern on site/in the area will be substantially altered by the 492 unit residential development.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 3. Fire

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?<br>*Project is located in Fire Zone 4 (Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element: Wildland & Urban Fire Hazards)* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?<br>*New roads will need to be constructed to serve the 492 residential units.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?<br>*Public water infrastructure will be constructed to serve the project site.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? |
| g. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 4. Noise

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?<br>*Antelope Valley Freeway (14) is less than one mile from the project site.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?<br>*492 single family residences are proposed; existing residential community is within 500 feet of the project site.* |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?<br>*Construction noise and operational noise* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?<br>*Construction noise and operational noise* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? |
| | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course? |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *NPDES compliance is required; increase in amounts of runoff; existing drainage course on site.* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *NPDES compliance is required; increase in amounts of runoff; existing drainage course on site.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?<br>*492 residential units and a park site are proposed.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?<br>*Substantial increase in vehicle traffic and emissions will result from project.* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?<br>*Approximately 5,000,000 cubic yards are proposed for grading (dust).* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?<br>*Urban density residential use in hillside area* |
| f. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?<br>*Santa Clarita Valley is a non-attainment area* |
| g. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? *Project is likely to create cumulatively considerable net increase of pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.* |
| h. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☒ Air Quality Report

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 3. Biota

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?<br>*The project site is undeveloped with natural habitats.* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?<br>*Essentially all vegetation will be removed for future development and fire clearance.* |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?<br>*Tick Canyon Creek runs through the project site.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?<br>*semi-desert chaparral, non-native grassland, alluvial fan sage scrub, buckwheat and California sagebrush scrub.* |
| e. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?<br>*Scrub oak trees; mainland cherry trees are known to be present from the adjacent canyon.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?<br>*San Diego horned lizard, coastal California gnatcatcher are found in the area.. Sensitive plant species found in the area: slender-horned spineflower, San Fernando Valley spineflower, slender mariposa lily, Catalina mariposa lily, Plummer's mariposa lily, short-joint beaver tail.* |
| g. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?<br>*Wildlife movement corridor within Tick Canyon* |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?<br>*There is a drainage course and oak trees on the subject property.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |
| f. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors?<br>*Cultural resources have been found in the general area.* |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? |
| d. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?<br>*Antelope Valley Freeway is a designated Scenic Highway and is located to the south of the site.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?<br>*Santa Clara River Trail is proposed in the area.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?<br>*Project site is 500 acres in size and is undeveloped.* |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? |
| f. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?<br>*5,000,000 cubic yards of grading is proposed; hillside areas will be altered for development.* |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?<br>*492 residential units are proposed within one mile of Antelope Valley Freeway (14).* |
| b. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?<br>*New road construction is planned as part of the proposed project.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? |
| d. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?<br>*New road construction is planned as part of the proposed project.* |
| e. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?<br>*Substantial increase in vehicle trips; project traffic will impact Antelope Valley Freeway and existing roadways in the City of Santa Clarita. CMP Threshold for single-family residential uses is 50 units.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? |
| g. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☒ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?<br>*It is anticipated that new extension to a sewer trunk line will be constructed and the project area will annex to Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts 26 & 32 and the Saugus Water Reclamation Plant and Valencia Water Reclamation Plant (??).* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?<br>*New extension to a sewer trunk line will be required to serve the project site.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 3. Education

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?<br>*William S. Hart High School District and Sulphur Springs School District are operating over capacity.* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?<br>*Pine Tree Community School; Sierra Vista Junior High School; Canyon High School* |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Could the project create student transportation problems?<br>*It is anticipated that most students will arrive by private vehicles.* |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?<br>*Project site will be served by County Library District 1; current shelf space and volume levels are inadequate.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?<br>*Approximately 4 miles to Fire Station 107: 18239 W. Soledad Canyon Road, Canyon Country, CA 91351-3521*<br>*Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff Station: 23740 Magic Mountain Pkwy., Valencia California 91355* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? |
| c. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Fire Mitigation Fee

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *It is anticipated that infrastructure will be constructed to provide connection to the Newhall County Water District; no infrastructure currently exists on site. Annexation to the district will be required.* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *Water supplies are limited in the region.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *Project will generate a substantial amount of solid waste.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *One public park is proposed on site. A new fire station and/or Sheriff substation is proposed for a project in the immediate vicinity due to cumulatively significant impact on service response times.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? |
| b. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? *Undeveloped hillside areas will be developed for urban residential use.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? |
| d. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

*This issue will be addressed in conjunction with the discussion of other pertinent factors in the EIR including the "Visual" factor.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? |
| e. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? |
| g. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? |
| h. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? |
| i. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? |
| j. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? |
| | | | | *Proposed project is at urban density in a non-urban area.* |
| b. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? |
| c. | | | | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria: |
| | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Hillside Management Criteria? |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | SEA Conformance Criteria? |
| | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Other? |
| d. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project physically divide an established community? |
| e. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |
| | | | | *Conditional Use Permit for Density Controlled Development and for Hillside* |
| | | | | *Management is required for the proposed project.* |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?<br>*Project is proposed on undeveloped land; new infrastructure is required.* |
| c. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? |
| d. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?<br>*492 single family residential units are proposed.* |
| e. | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?<br>*One public park is planned; other services may be required in the future.* |
| f. | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? |
| g. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Other factors? |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES /** ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment,** or **recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

| | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?<br>*Biota* |
| b. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.<br>*Traffic, Biota* |
| c. | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?<br>*Air Quality, Water Quality* |

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact